

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-4 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 5-7 have been examined based upon the merits.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu (U.S. Patent No. 5,972,144) in view of Jeffers (U.S. Patent No. 2,500,494). Further, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Jeffers as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Mohiuddin (U.S. Patent No. 4,350,739). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Jeffers as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Tukakoshi (U.S. Patent No. 5,226,993). Still further claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tukakoshi in view of Hsu and Jeffers. Finally, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tukakoshi in view of Hsu and Jeffers as applied to claims 5 and 7 and further in view of Hsu and Jeffers as applied to claims 5 and 7 above, and further in view of Mohiuddin. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicants have amended claim 5 by incorporating the limitation of claim 7 into claim 5, further specifying that the bi-adhesive sheet is applied to the back of the ornaments (*See* for support the first paragraph of page 5 of the description).

The reference Tukakoshi cited by the Examiner (in combination with the references Hsu and Jeffres) against claim 7 as filed teaches clearly away from such feature. Col. 4, lines 3-32 of Tukakoshi, as well as figures 3 and 5 thereof indicate indeed that the ornament units 12 are first

demoulded. then inserted in a further arranging tool A and only after this stage the double-sided adhesive sheets 14 are adhered to the back of the ornament units 12. The corresponding process is thus much more complex and troublesome than the one presently claimed, which cannot thus be anticipated by Tukakoshi either alone or in combination with the other references Hsu and Jeffres.

Furthermore, the purpose of the bi-adhesive sheets is completely different in Tukakoshi and the present invention. In the former case, the bi-adhesive sheet maintains different ornament units - which would be per se separated - in a predetermined relative position in which they are adhered to the desired substrate (see col. 2, lines 27-32). In the latter case, the bi-adhesive sheet facilitates the demoulding, but afterwards it is cut in order to render independent the single ornamental units, which are identical and must be each adhered to a respective different substrate, e.g. the rear of a motor vehicle (see e.g. page 1, first paragraph of the description). It would be indeed plainly meaningless and antiaesthetical to arrange several identical plates with the name of the vehicle type on the same car and it is common experience that only a single plate of this type is arranged on the rear of a single vehicle.

Finally - as acknowledged by the Examiner himself - Tukakoshi relates to an injection molding technology, which is different from the casting technology provided by the present invention.

The above arguments constitutes thus further evidence that it would be fully unobvious for the skilled in the art to combine the reference Tukakoshi with the other references Hsu and Jeffers, in order to devise the presently claimed process.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 8, 2008